

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on June 25, 2008, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 15-20, and 22-26 have been amended for clarification. Support for these amendments may be found at least in Figure 2 and in paragraphs 0032-0035 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 15-20, and 22-26 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 15-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 15-20 and 22-26 are rejected for allegedly reciting “a single means” which is not appear in combination with another recited element of means, and thus being unduly broad. In response, claims 15-20 have been amended to recite a computer system comprising a memory for storing executable program code and a processor, functionally coupled to the memory, the processor being responsive to computer-executable instructions contained in the program code and operative to perform the recited claim elements. Similarly, claims 22-26 have been amended to recite a telephone system comprising a memory for storing executable program code and a processor, functionally coupled to the memory, the processor being responsive to computer-executable instructions contained in the program code and operative to perform the recited claim elements. Support for these amendments may be found at least in Figure 2 and in paragraphs 0032-0035 in the Applicant’s specification (with respect to the telephone system, paragraph 0035 discusses how a wireless telephone may contain a processor chip that runs the roaming minutes

module on the wireless telephone itself). Based on the foregoing amendments to claims 15-20 and 22-26, it is respectfully submitted that the claims recite a combination of means for performing the specified claim features and accordingly, the undue breadth rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-12 are rejected as being unpatentable for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-12 have been amended to recite a computer-implemented method. Support for these amendments may be found at least in Figure 2 and in paragraphs 0032-0035 in the Applicant's specification (for example, paragraph 0035 discusses how the computer system of Figure 2 may implement a method for performing the features specified in the claims). Based on the foregoing amendments to claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-12, it is respectfully submitted that the claims recite a computer platform for performing the claimed features. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101, First Paragraph be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: September 25, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

